



## Central Valley Flood Protection Plan

### Meeting Summary Final

### Delta Regional Conditions Work Group Meeting #4

**Time:** October 8, 2009, 9:00 am – 3:00 pm

**Location:** City of West Sacramento City Hall

1110 West Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento CA

Presentations and Materials Available Online at [www.water.ca.gov/cvfm](http://www.water.ca.gov/cvfm)

#### MEETING ATTENDANCE:

##### Members Present:

Name	Organization
Ronald Baldwin	Office of Emergency Services
John Cain	American Rivers, California Flood Management
Todd Bruce	The Dutra Group, Hearing Board Member, Solano/Yolo Air Quality Management District
Kara DiFrancesco	Natural Heritage Institute
Marci Coglianese	Bay-Delta Pubic Advisory Committee, Delta Levees and Habitat Sub-committee
Karen Medders	North Delta CARES
Christopher Neudeck	KSN Inc., Sacramento San Joaquin Delta (District Engineer), CCVFCA, Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency, Habitat Advisory Committee to Delta Levee Subventions Program
Terry Roscoe	California Fish and Game
Robin Kulakow	Yolo Basin Foundation
Sameer Sharideh	San Joaquin County; San Joaquin County Flood Control and WC District; San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency
Dave Shpak	City of West Sacramento
Chuck Spinks	American Society of Civil Engineers
Jan Vick	Mayor, City of Rio Vista

##### Team Present:

Bryan Brock	DWR (Work Group Lead)
Eric Poncelet	Kearns and West (K&W) (Facilitation Team)
Ken Kirby	Kirby Consulting Group, Inc
Ibrahim Khadam	MWH (Technical Team)
Christal Love	Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) (Facilitation Team)
Merritt Rice	DWR, Central Valley Flood Protection Office (CVFPO – Project Lead)
Robert Yeadon	DWR, Regional Coordinator
Josh Yang	MWH (Technical Team)

##### Observers:

Gary Hester, DWR

Yung-Hsin Sun, MWH

## WORK GROUP ACTION ITEMS

	ITEM	OWNER	TIMEFRAME
1.	Homework	Work Group	10/15/09
2.	Send schedule of local government briefings to Work Group	Ken Kirby	ASAP
3.	Confirm Work Group Contact Lists are on the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) SharePoint project website	Christal Love	10/16/09
4.	Ensure that all emails include clear subject lines that include CVFPP	Entire Team	Ongoing
5.	Add CVFPP SharePoint project website tutorial to the meeting 5 agenda	Eric Poncelet	10/22/09
6.	Add definition of "flood protection" to Glossary	Ibrahim Khadam	10/22/09
7.	Incorporate Work Group comments into revision of problems/opportunities and goals/objectives documents	Ibrahim Khadam	10/22/09
8.	Provide any additional feedback on synthesized problems and opportunities statements and CVFPP goals, principles, legislative requirements and objectives	Work Group	10/15/09

### GROUP RECAP (meeting highlights for use by Work Group partners in their communications)

The Delta Regional Conditions Work Group (Work Group) of the CVFMP Program continued its work on October 8, 2009 with the following actions:

- Review Topic Work Group progress
- Review and confirm synthesized problems and opportunities statements from meeting #3
- Review and refine draft goals and principles for the CVFPP
- Discuss Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and CVFPP coordination

The Work Group's purpose is the development of content for the Regional Conditions Summary Report (RCSR), a key component for developing the 2012 CVFPP. The RCSR will identify resources, conditions within the Central Valley, flood management and related problems and opportunities, and goals and objectives for use in preparing the CVFPP. The Delta Work Group is one of five regional Work Groups in the Central Valley.

### MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Clarify the 2012 CVFPP report structure and content
- Address issues raised in meeting # 3
- Provide roadmap of remaining meetings - process, content, document
- Provide status updates on Topic Work Groups
- Continue refinement of Problem and Opportunity Statements (Chapter 3)
- Introduce and begin work on Goals and Objectives (Chapter 4)

## MEETING SUMMARY

### SUMMARY:

#### Welcome and Greetings

Eric Poncelet (K&W) opened the meeting, introduced himself as the Workgroup's new facilitator, discussed facility logistics, meeting materials and asked meeting participants to introduce themselves. He then reviewed the meeting agenda and provided a walkthrough of the day's materials/handouts.

Bryan Brock (DWR) explained the revised meeting schedule and thanked the group for their patience. He mentioned that touring the Dutra Museum after meeting 5 was an option for the group to consider. Several members of the group expressed interest in participating in the museum tour.

#### Opening Remarks

Ken Kirby (Kirby Consulting Group, Inc) delivered opening remarks, and clarified the 2012 CVFPP report structure and content. Mr. Kirby explained that DWR is trying to be comprehensive, and is putting together three legislative documents (the CVFPP, State Plan of Flood Control Descriptive Document, and Flood Control System Status Report) and a history document. He announced that DWR would begin creating a programmatic California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report in early 2010.

Mr. Kirby then addressed an issue raised during meeting 3 regarding the revised meeting schedule. Mr. Kirby explained that near-term meetings between the various Regional Conditions Work Groups would not be practical with the reduced number of meetings. However, the opportunity for Work Groups to interact would occur at the Valley-Wide Forum scheduled to occur in late January. He added that the planning team has already begun to integrate feedback they received from the Regional Conditions Work Groups and the Topic Work Groups.

Mr. Kirby then mentioned that the memorandum from Mike Chrisman, Secretary for Natural Resources, regarding coordination between the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Process and the FloodSAFE California Initiative would be discussed in detail later in the afternoon when Jerry Johns joined the group.

Mr. Kirby announced that, in response to questions about the content of the 2012 CVFPP in relationship to the compliance requirements of local jurisdictions, a series of local briefing meetings would be set up. At the request of a Work Group member, Mr. Kirby committed to having the local meeting briefing schedule distributed to the Work Group members (**see Action Item #2**)

#### Discussion:

- A Work Group member expressed their interest in seeing the work products from the CVFPP process be made available to other groups, such as BDCP.
- A Work Group member expressed their interest in seeing the contact lists for each of the Work Groups. Christal Love (CCP) committed to making sure the lists had been posted on the project website (**see Action Item #3**).
- A Work Group member stressed the importance of producing a plan that can be used to fight floods.

#### Review of Previous Meeting #3 Action Items

Bryan Brock provided an overview of the status of the action items from meeting 3. After a general review the following topics generated additional comment.

- All team members will ensure that email subject lines are clear
- A SharePoint website tutorial will be added to the agenda for meeting 5 (**see Action Item #5**).

## Overview of Roadmap and Topic Work Group Progress

Mr. Khadam provided the Work Group members an update of the project schedule, tasks, and deliverables of the Topic Work Groups (**see PowerPoint presentation**). He also explained the purpose of and how each work product would be used in the Regional Summary Report.

Merritt Rice (DWR) added that there had been questions regarding how far into the Delta would DWR's Non-Urban Levee Evaluation program extend. He stated that that process is focusing on the State – Federal system but that there was a need as part of the CVFPP to look at the entire levee Delta systems. He mentioned that the CVFPP team is continuing to review how to include the non-project levees into the current analysis.

## Review Synthesized Problems and Opportunities Statements

Mr. Khadam presented an overview of the synthesized problems and opportunities statements (**see PowerPoint presentation**) and explained that the planning team was able to condense the input from all of the Regional Conditions Work Groups into seven problem categories and 20 problem statements. Mr. Poncelet then read each of the categories to the Work Group. Afterwards, work group members raised the following questions and comments:

- Divide the tidal perspective from the river perspective within the problems and opportunities table.
- Problem statement 2 did not seem to be a problem statement. A Work Group member felt as though the issue was that levees are not handling the flow durations.
- Suggested creating very board problem statements.
- Found the table to be an excellent format; but requested an additional table with all the detailed statements.
- The terms flow and elevation do not mean the same thing in the Delta. In the Delta there is an only one design criterion: elevation.
- Distinguish between all the ways a levee can fail before it overtops.
- Add the following additional sub bullets under statement 2:
  - Changes in wind patterns and intensity
  - Wind erosion
- Add a category or new problem statement regarding climate change.
- Add an additional sub bullet under statement 4:
  - D) downstream capacity is constrained
- The term native habitat means different things to different people.
- Add text under statement 7 that matches the current regulatory process.
- Add an additional sub bullet under statement 8:
  - f) lack of connectivity between rivers and floodplains
- Flood system does not accommodate the natural flood processes.
- Statement 13 part A is very important to cities.
- Emergency response text under statement 18 may not be strong enough.

The Work Group members were asked to take a detailed look at the problems and opportunities table as part of their homework and submit any comments to Mr. Brock by October 15<sup>th</sup> (**see Action Item #7**).

The Work Group then reviewed the level of importance column in the problems and opportunities table and made the following comments.

- It was interesting that the category with the highest number of circles was emergency response.
- Paradise Cut bypass was of high importance to the Delta.
- Problem statement 16 a) should include potential impact of gas well contamination.

Directly after meeting 4, a Work Group member provided the following comments on the problems and opportunities table via email. Suggested additional text is underlined, Work Group member comments on text are in *italics*.

- *Add a third problem statement to Category VI - Emergency Response*

XX) Effective Flood Fight Response to threats to levee integrity is hindered from achieving an optimal standard by:

- a) Lack of sufficient emergency funds or delegated spending authority to allow prompt action by local or State agencies.
- b) Concentration of ability to fund more expensive engineering responses to levee problems at State and Federal levels which overloads the ability of those agencies to respond to the many problems created by a widespread flood. Lack of such funds at LMA level prevents decentralization of response to common threats to levee integrity with its advantage of faster response when problems are widespread.
- c) Lack of clarity of role and commitment of city, County, and State agencies to Flood Fight response.
- d) FEMA regulations that penalize agencies other than LMAs that respond to threats to levee integrity and thereby discourage such timely response.

18) Effective Public Safety Agency Emergency Response to protect the public from the results of flooding is limited by:

- a) Institutional capacity, resources, and coordination
- b) Local and regional response that could be more effective and efficient with additional planning
- c) Lack of comprehensive mutual aid agreements  
*I don't agree with this one since the one thing we do have is good mutual aid agreements. You need to understand what "mutual aid" means. Someone put this here, I would just like to hear their rationale for doing so.*
- d) Insufficient funding

19) Existing post flood recovery plans and programs do not adequately address:

- a) Debris removal
- b) Timely restoration of utilities
- c) Jurisdictional responsibilities
- d) Coordination
- e) Agricultural recovery
- f) Regional economic recovery

Related to the problem statements, a Work Group member provided the following three definitions:

- Emergency Response - All actions, procedures, plans, and resources used or implemented at the time of a flood or at the time that the potential for a levee failure is recognized.
- Flood Fight - Those actions, procedures, and plans that bear on responding to threats to levee integrity to prevent failure or to containing flood waters in the event of a failure and returning the impounded water back into water channels.
- Flood Management - Those actions, procedures, and plans that bear on overseeing, maintaining, and improving flood control facilities and operations prior to the commencement of a flood

## **Introduce CVFPP Goals, Principles, Legislative Requirements & Objectives**

Mr. Khadam walked the group through the definitions of the goals, objectives, principles and requirements (see PowerPoint presentation). He explained how the CVFPP goals were developed, how they are consistent with FloodSAFE goals and how the community success factors fold into the goals. The proposed CVFPP goals deal with the following:

- Central Valley Flood Protection
- Delta Flood Protection
- Natural Processes
- Sustainable Management
- Implementation Framework

He then reviewed the CVFPP objectives and requirements, and reminded the group that they would have a detailed discussion of the objectives at the next meeting.

The Work Group made the following comments regarding goals, principles, legislative requirements and objectives:

- Add the following principle:
  - The Central Valley Flood Protection Plan as implemented by the State of California and its sub-divisions will address equally and into the future the safety and economic welfare of all Californians currently protected by that system.
- What would be considered a principle vs. a goal and how they are related is confusing. Mr. Kirby explained that his view of principles was that they are a safety net put around activities.
- Include reducing conflicts between water supply and flood control as a principle.
- The Delta flood protection goal is unclear.
- The term flood protection means DWR is proposing to keep floods from happening. Mr. Kirby clarified that he called that flood management.
- Is it appropriate to set quantitative objectives before it is known how to set or achieve the objectives. Mr. Rice added that one of the problems that occurred during the Comprehensive Study was setting up objectives or constraints that were not achievable.
- Cumulative impacts of development are very important; and that this plan needs to account for the additional flows into the Delta system as a result of said development.

## **Homework Overview, Next Steps, Action Items, and Meeting Recap**

An overview of specific action items discussed throughout the day was presented. The group then reviewed the agenda and was asked whether or not the meeting goals were reached. Work Group members did not raise any concerns about reaching the meeting goals.

## **Discussion with Jerry Johns about BDCP and CVFPP**

Jerry Johns (DWR Deputy Director, Water Resources Planning & Management) provided an overview of water management in the Delta, and the history of BDCP and CVFPP processes. He stated that DWR was beginning to knit the two programs together and invited Work Group members to ask him questions about the two programs.

- A Work Group member stated that they were one of the people at the first Delta meeting to request coordination with BDCP. The member said that it did not make sense to describe the

Delta conditions when what the conditions look like depends upon what comes out of the BDCP process. The member asked what the potential near-term BDCP actions would be?

Mr. Johns responded that the Delta is not likely to be in 50 years what it is today. The CalFED experience was to treat the Delta as a static system; however, no change seems unlikely. He stated that the State will not survive if DWR keeps operating the water supply system the way they currently do. He explained that the BDCP program will have dual conveyance, but that the specific details have not been figured out yet. He announced that DWR's current proposal is to have 1/3 of the water supply still come out of the Delta.

- A Work Group member related that they had been told at a recent briefing that if the canal was built across the Delta it would only be necessary to protect the canal with levees, not the other Delta areas.

Mr. Johns responded that the idea would be to build a canal so that it does not depend on the Delta levees.

- A Work Group member observed that Delta residents are interested in protecting rural communities and that the focus of the California Water Code is on more than just project water supply.

Mr. Johns responded that BDCP is not addressing levee maintenance in the Delta. Levee maintenance is being discussed as part of the CVFPP.

- A Work Group member commented that what CVFPP is doing is way beyond just levees. There is overlap where floodplains provide habitat. He expressed hope that the Work Group could think more broadly about these issues.

Mr. Johns responded that when the canal was considered before, the proposal was to take a lot more water out of the Delta. The current proposal would include a smaller canal and a modest outtake (3,000 cfs) to keep the Delta water quality from getting stagnant. Mr. Johns stressed that the plan will not abandon the Delta.

- A Work Group member commented that it appears that BDCP is moving forward without considering the issues brought up by the Yolo Basin Foundation. The member asked DWR to provide a flood inundation map and respond to requests for information.

Mr. Johns responded that efforts would be made to better coordinate with the Yolo Basin Foundation. He stated that these types of issues and exchanges of information need to be occurring at the Work Group level because the BDCP is currently evaluating the Yolo Bypass at a conceptual level.

- A Work Group member requested putting milestones into the plan and stated that if DWR waits until the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement to coordinate with Stakeholders, it will be too late to allow for meaningful input.

Mr. Johns agreed.

- A Work Group member questioned the openness of the BDCP process and the ability of one particular stakeholder to join. Another Work Group member remarked that they felt that both the BDCP and the CVFPP processes are open to input and that in order to join BDCP the stakeholder needed to sign on to the planning agreement.
- A Work Group member expressed concern regarding the pending sunset of the Delta levees funding program, stating that the funding for a particular part of the program would be maxed at 2 million dollars.
- A Work Group member asked Mr. Johns what his opinion was of the Strategic Levee Plan.

Mr. Johns responded that DWR needs to know what the long term plan is to bridge the plan and provided Prospect Island as an example of what could be done. Mr. Kirby added that the interim levee funding strategy is being developed by FloodSAFE, and the long-term levee funding strategy may be brought into the CVFPP process.

## **Adjourn**